



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/868,435	10/01/2001	Daniel Doll-Steinberg	69512.000004	1453
21967 7590 02/01/2008 HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 1900 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109			EXAMINER SHERR, CRISTINA O	
			ART UNIT 3621	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/01/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/868,435

Applicant(s)

DOLL-STEINBERG, DANIEL

Examiner

CRISTINA OWEN SHERR

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 25-31 and 50-76 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25-31 and 50-76 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to applicant's amendment filed October 29, 2007. Claims 26-31 and 50-76 are currently pending in this case. Claims 26, 27, and 50 have been amended.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 26-31 and 50-76 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 26-31 and 50-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slik et al (5809145) in view of Richardson (5490216) further in view of Blumenthal (WO 98/16033).

5. Regarding claim 26 –
Slik et al (See Figs. 3-6, 16, Col. 18, lines 30-55) disclose a means for distributing digital data with a remote licensing center issuing a release code to a local media store substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention, is the use of explicit customer selected information. It is noted that the user selection of

digital data and subsequent data exchange prior to purchase is functionally equivalent to the claim limitations.

6. Richardson (See Fig. 2-10) shows the manufacture of software based on user selection.

7. Blumenthal further shows the manufacture of software based on user demand, further including packaging and manuals generation for the media (pg 11 In 14-22). It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Slik et al because user selection and naming are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations.

8. Regarding the print limitations of claim 27, Richardson (See Fig. 2-10) shows the manufacture of software based on user selection, which can obviously include a printed display shown in the Figures that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations.

9. Regarding protocol limitations of claim 28, Richardson (See Fig. 2-10) shows the manufacture of software based on user selection, which can obviously include a printed display shown in the Figures that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Blumenthal further shows the manufacture of software based on user demand, further including packaging and manuals generation for the media (pg 11 In 14-22).

10. Regarding personalization limitations of claim 29, Richardson (See Fig. 2-10) shows the manufacture of software based on user selection and thus personalized that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

11. Regarding the cd limitations of claim 30, Richardson (See Fig. 2-10) shows the manufacture of software based on user selection on cd media that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations.

12. Regarding print limitations of claim 31 Richardson {See Fig. 2-10) shows the manufacture of software based on user selection, which can obviously include a printed display shown in the Figures {which can employ any of the ubiquitous cd labeling applets) that is conventional functional, equivalent of the claim limitations. Blumenthal further shows the manufacture of software based on user demand, further including packaging and manuals generation for the media (pg 11 ln 14-22).

13. Regarding claim 50 –
Slik et al (See Figs. 3-6, 16, Col. 18, lines 30-55) disclose a method for distributing digital data with a remote licensing center issuing a release code to a local media store substantially as claimed. The difference between the above and the claimed invention is the use of explicit customer selected information. It is noted that the user selection of digital data and subsequent data exchange prior to purchase is functionally equivalent to the claim limitations. Richardson (See Fig. 2-10) shows the manufacture of software based on user selection. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Slik et al because user selection and naming are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations.

14. Regarding the user limitations of claim 51, Richardson (See Fig. 2-10) shows the manufacture of software based on user selection on cd media that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations.

15. Regarding the print limitations of claim 52, Richardson (See Fig. 2-10) shows the manufacture of software based on user selection, which can obviously include a printed display shown in the Figures that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations.

16. Regarding protocol limitations of claim 53, Richardson (See Fig. 2-10) shows the manufacture of software based on user selection, which can obviously include a printed display shown in the Figures that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

17. Regarding the storage limitations of claims 54-55, Richardson (See Fig. 2-10) shows the manufacture of software based on user selection on cd media that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations.

18. Regarding print limitations of claims 56-57, Richardson (See Fig. 2-10) shows the manufacture of software based on user selection, which can obviously include a printed display shown in the Figures (which can employ any of the ubiquitous cd labeling applets) that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

19. Regarding authenticity limitations of claims 58-59, Richardson (See Fig. 2-10) shows the manufacture of software based on user selection and thus personalized that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

20. Regarding print limitations of claims 60-62, Richardson (See Fig. 2-10) shows the manufacture of software based on user selection, which can obviously include a printed display shown in the Figures (which can employ any of the ubiquitous cd labeling applets) that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

21. Regarding the sale limitations of claims 63-68, Slik et al (See Figs. 3-6, 16, Col. 18, lines 30-55) disclose a method for distributing digital data with a remote licensing center issuing a release code to a local media store that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

22. Regarding sale limitations of claims 69-75, Richardson (See Fig. 2-10) shows the manufacture of software based on user selection and thus personalized that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations because of the standard sale types enumerated.

23. Examiner's Note: Although Examiner has cited particular columns, line numbers and figures in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant(s), the specified citations are merely representative of the teaching of the prior art that are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim and other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that the applicant(s), in preparing the response, fully consider the items of evidence in their entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Conclusion

24. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 3621

25. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CRISTINA OWEN SHERR whose telephone number is (571)272-6711. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 Monday through Friday.

27. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew J. Fischer can be reached on (571)272-6779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3621

28. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Cristina Owen Sherr
Patent Examiner, AU 3621



ANDREW J. FISCHER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600